

Atty Docket No.: TKHR4580

Serial No.: 09/479,483

REMARKSPresent Status of the Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on September 23, 2003. Claims 1-5 and 18-22 remain pending of which claims 1-2 and 18-21 have been amended to more explicitly and to more clearly describe the claimed invention. It is believed that no new matter is added by way of these amendments made to the claims or specification or otherwise to the application. Reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection are courteously solicited.

Response to Rejections under 35 U. S. C. 112, 2nd paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

In rejecting the above claims the Office Action indicated that the term "transmittance" is not an intrinsic property of materials but instead is measured relative to particular wavelengths of radiation.

In response thereto, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18 to recite "...a transmittance of the second protective layer is higher than a transmittance of the first protective layer under a visible light range". As one skilled in the art would know that for the operation of a reflective

Atty Docket No.: TKHR4580

Serial No.: 09/479,483

micro-LCD device, visible light is typically the light source of the reflective micro-LCD device. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the amendment to claims 1 and 18 introduces no new matter.

In rejecting the above claims the Office Action also indicated that there is a great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the limitations of claims 1-5 and 18-22.

Applicant respectfully submits to the Office that the amendments made to claims 1-2 and 18-21 to correct the various typographical errors would allow a proper interpretation of the limitations of these claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are most earnestly requested.

Atty Docket No.: TKHR4580

Serial No.: 09/479,483


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-5 and 18-22 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 11/24/2003

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949) 660-0809


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330